UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Lessons of a Disillusioned Radicalism - - - - - - - - - - *A. Stiernotte*

Refugee Facts - - *Dorothy Walton Binder*

What We Can Do About It - *Karl Chworowsky*

That Word Neutrality - - *O. A. Hammand*

The Spirit Behind the Nazi German Empire - - - - - - - - - *Taraknath Das*

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 7

Chicago, December 4, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 103
Jottings—J. H. H. 105
ARTICLES—
The Lessons of a Disillusioned Radicalism—A. STIERNOTTE 106
Refugee Facts—DOROTHY WALTON BINDER 109
What We Can Do About It—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 110
That Word Neutrality—O. A. HAMMAND 111
On the Pacifist Front—IV 112
The Spirit Behind the Nazi German Empire—TARAKNATH DAS 114
POETRY—
Adventure—LLOYD FRANK MERRELL 113
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
The Challenge—KATHERINE FINNIGAN ANDERSON 108
Forgotten—GRADY MCCARTY LONG 108
The Just War—GEOFFREY JOHNSON 108
They Will Not Learn—CLINTON RINGGO HULL 108
Ypres 1919—EDWIN BARLOW EVANS 108
THE STUDY TABLE—
Book Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 115
A Jewish Commentary—C. A. HAWLEY 115
CORRESPONDENCE—
Christianity and Peace—E. H. BARRETT 116
Christian Action—CARL PETERSON 116
THE FIELD—
We Like the British, But—*Nofrontier News Service* 102
The Thin Red Line—*Nofrontier News Service* 116
Thus Far and No Farther—J. L. GARVIN, *London Observer* 116

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

We Like the British, But—

Americans and other neutrals who have no wish to be drawn into war, undoubtedly feel profound respect and even affection for their British cousins, and the deepest sympathy for the British people as a whole in the sufferings through which they have now to go, and for many British institutions sufficiently democratic to justify in some measure, at any rate, the British claims to be fighting for the preservation of democratic customs. But do not the British authorities, and particularly the British press, need the advice of what Americans call a "Public Relations Council"?

The struggle is one against tyranny and false conceptions of racial superiority. But the leading shops are offering gas mask carriers in a variety of lovely shades, one of which is advertised as "nigger."

The British press wants America to back up the British cause. But one prominent commentator in the Sunday *Chronicle* says: "It was in America that our propaganda was most successful during the last war . . . I think we ought to bring a woman into the propaganda business. The best propagandist in America today is Eleanor Roosevelt, the President's wife." The writer then goes on to nominate as the outstanding woman radio propagandist the Italian woman, now in America, who resigned from her job as announcer for Mussolini, but who did not quarrel with the Fascist regime until she had done an excellent job of falsification about the invasion of Ethiopia.

Again and again, however, sober peace spokesmen assert, as does the *Observer*, that "America will decide for herself whether her policy is to be changed. Propaganda from this side would do only harm." But the British press is substantially united, thanks to its editorial staffs and its correspondents in the United States—who are no slouches as propagandists themselves—in building up the impression that a heavy percentage of the appeals sent to Washington against the lifting of the embargo on arms shipments were due to paid propagandists from Berlin and Moscow.

Practically every intelligent spokesman of thoughtful groups in Great Britain, happily, has hastened to go on record as favoring a fair policy and a program for settlement of the war that would avoid the mistakes of 1914-18. Opinion in many, many quarters is against the causes for which the World War was fought, the secret commitments of Great Britain, the deceit of American public opinion, and the unwisdom of the Versailles Treaty. Yet, instead of frankly recognizing the improvements in many respects of Britain's part in the previous war, her press spokesmen are trying to insist that the role of Great Britain in 1914 and the later wartime years, was almost without blemish. Even the sober London *Times*, ignoring enough volumes of accumulated historical documentation to fill a wing of the British Museum, criticizes those who, in America, "ex-

(*Continued on page* 116)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1939 No. 7

WAR

But what most showed the vanity of life
Was to behold the nations all on fire,
In cruel broils engaged and deadly strife:
Most Christian kings, inflamed by black desire,
With honorable ruffians in their hire,
Cause war to rage and blood around to pour;
Of this sad work when each begins to tire,
They set them down just where they were before,
Till for new scenes of woe, peace shall their force restore.

JAMES THOMSON, in *The Castle of Indolence*

HOW LONG WILL THIS WAR GO ON?

This war—how long can it keep going? The question is prompted by reports from Finland of the distress suffered by that gallant little country through the sheer drain upon her resources from the mobilization against Russia. Other neutral countries, especially Belgium and Holland, are subject to similar exhaustion. And if this is true of the neutrals, what about the belligerents which are staggering under burdens never before known in history? Even if expenses can be met, what about the morale of the people? How long can it bear up under the strain? The Munich explosion, assuming that it was not another Reichstag fire, presents incontrovertible evidence of stress in Germany. Reports multiply that the German people are restive under rationing of food and clothing—reports which seem to be confirmed by similar reports from France and England. Not a day passes without its story of popular resentment against blackouts and other war precautions. Women and children, evacuated from Paris and London and other cities, are drifting back to their homes in contempt of governmental advice and in resentment against governmental dictation. Strange events are taking place in English conscientious objectors' courts, where objectors are being applauded and attacks upon war loudly cheered. Daily reiteration in censored dispatches of "the superb morale" of English and French troops at the front stirs suspicion, after the tenth or eleventh story, that morale is pretty bad. Fraternization between German and French troops seems to be constant, in spite of all efforts to suppress it. Radio concerts are shared, messages exchanged—and on one occasion at least whole regiments of German troops were transferred in order to break up the good fellowship everywhere prevailing between supposedly hostile forces. Is it possible that the war is not starting for the reason that neither side trusts either its troops or its people to sustain bloody action? Is there any explanation of a war that is not begun except that there is no will to war adequate to drive the enormous machine of combat? Meanwhile, with little fighting, no progress toward decision, no action but only talk, the enormous expense goes on, and bankruptcy impends. The present situation, of course, cannot continue. Something must finally happen. The break must come. Who knows but what it may be a collapse of morale, an outburst of public revolt, on both sides of the battle line, which will end war in revolution?

WAR GIVES A HELPING HAND TO CANCER

The immeasurable calamity of war is sometimes better indicated by its indirect than its direct consequences. For example, look at this piece of news which came some weeks ago from the Third International Cancer Congress held at Atlantic City! A clue to cancer prevention was described at this Congress by Dr. Thomas Lumsden, of the London Cancer Hospital. It consists of a substance contained in the blood of cancerous animals which is able to kill cancer cells artificially grown in glass dishes. "This serum and the laboratory materials," said Dr. Lumsden, "already have been destroyed. The London hospital has been converted into a clearing station for casualties of air raids. I left London before the war, and as it would not be possible to store the cancer materials, I left orders to destroy them on declaration of war." This brilliant specialist has himself abandoned his work in cancer research for the duration of the war, and enlisted for war medical service. How many other specialists have thus put aside their scientific inquiries, and how many other laboratories have been closed and materials destroyed, may not be known. But at this same Cancer Congress, U. S. Surgeon-General Thomas Parran gave it as his opinion that "the four years of the World War nullified, wiped out, the results of probably forty years of medical progress. The lifetime of a hundred laboratories, of a thousand scientists, yes, of hundreds of thousands of doctors, was gone for naught." On this basis of what the last war did, it is not altogether impossible to estimate what this present and far more

terrible war will do. This is one little illustration of what is meant by the destruction of civilization and a return to the dark ages. When medical science is stayed, when education goes to pieces (i.e., all but four of Germany's great universities are now closed!), when literature languishes, when knowledge is neglected or forgotten, when all men's energies are devoted to destroying all that men's energies have created, it means that the light of the world is being extinguished, and the blackout of darkness is at hand.

BALLOTS, POLLS, AND "HAM AN' EGGS"

The smashing defeat of the "Ham an' Eggs" proposal in California and of Bigelow's loosely conceived old-age endowment plan in Ohio stirs philosophizing in minds made quiet by the passing of Election Day. As the weeks have gone by since this amazing display of electoral level-headedness, one feels a new and exhilarating confidence in democracy. Why dally with theories of totalitarianism or any form of highly centralized control of government, when the common people can so well take care of their own interests? These two referendum proposals, one in the East and the other in the far West, show one thing conclusively, and that is that, given an adequate time for free discussion and dissemination of information, the voters *en masse* can be trusted to pass judgment on public issues with wisdom and sanity. Here were schemes admirably adapted to deceive the people with bounteous promises of easy money. "Get rich quick" schemes—what things are more dangerous in a democracy? Yet in both states, Ohio and California, the simple voters rose up in a flood of protest, to defeat forever these wild-eyed ideas. Given full opportunity to think and discuss, the people saw the point, and saved themselves and their states from ruin. It might have been otherwise had "Ham an' Eggs" been sprung on the electorate for snap judgment, for we hold the extended debate of these issues, itself an essential feature of the democratic process, to be absolutely essential to right results. Which suggests the query—what are these quick-fire, instantaneous Gallup and *Fortune Magazine* polls worth? In a flash, without warning or any informational discussion, a question of vital concern is submitted to the voters. It may be the third term, or lifting the embargo, or—"Ham an' Eggs." Instantaneously there must be a "Yes" or a "No" reply. And in due course a poll is published as the sentiment of the people on this, that, or the other question. Many objections may be urged against the poll in a democracy—among others that the poll itself helps to fashion public opinion without adequate warrant. But no objection, to our mind, cuts so close to the quick as this fact that a poll is snatched from the air. Without prolonged and free discussion, Democracy may at any time be betrayed.

NONETHELESS—OLD AGE!

Satisfaction over the defeat of crack-pot old-age relief proposals of the California and Ohio brand must not blind us to the reality which has stirred such crazy schemes. In the foreground stands the continuing depression, with old men and women as among the chief sufferers. In the background stands a fact not yet noted and understood in all its magnitude—namely, that increasingly this country is becoming a nation of elderly people. Look at some figures recently brought forward by Mr. Mark Sullivan! Twenty-four years ago, in 1915, the number of babies born in each thousand of population was 25.1. In 1937, the latest date for which figures are available, the number was 17.6. At the same time the average length of life is steadily increasing. Thus, a baby born in 1900 could expect to live on the average 48.23 years. One born in 1930, the last census year, could expect to live 59.06 years. Fewer babies today are being born, and those born live much longer. What this means in total population is amazing. Thus, at present, there are 8,000,000 men and women in this country over 64 years of age. Forty years from now the number will be at least 25,000,000 in a population which has increased in this period only from 130,000,000 to 155,000,000 persons. Now, what are we going to do with these aged? Under our existing economic system there is no remotest possibility of their being able to take care of themselves, and little possibility of their children (if any) being able to do so. The great masses of the people do not receive enough of the wealth produced by their labor to achieve self-support. The rapid reduction of the number of school children should correspondingly reduce educational expenditures, and this saving may well be applied to old-age relief. But what must be had, and what is crazily reached after in these dangerous "Ham an' Eggs" ideas, is a scientific system of old-age pensions and social security sustained and administered by government. The one way to dispose for good and all of these lunatic proposals is to meet them with some constructive and statesmanlike program which will safeguard helpless old age.

ONE GAIN AT LEAST

In the desolation cast upon the world by Russia, there is at least one gain which may well be noted for such comfort as it may yield. We refer to the fact that henceforth we are relieved of all the tortuous labor of making distinction between Communism and Fascism. They now belong together and henceforth may be lumped as one! Hitherto, we have struggled to point out differences between the two systems when Russian terror matched Italian and German terror, and totalitarianism in Moscow looked all too much like totalitarianism in Rome and Berlin. For Russia had been our hope! The revolution was one of the turning points in human history! The new democratic economy

of the Soviets was the actual breaking of the new day of freedom! Of course, this economic system is still there, and we hope it may remain and flourish. But, now we come to think of it in "the cold gray dawn of the morning after," the economy of Russia is no private possession of that land. As a pattern of economic and social life, it was outlined as long ago as Plato, and it is the possession at this moment of all the Socialist parties of the world. What is unique in Russia is the Communist Party as ruled by Stalin, and this Party, as we now see, and should have seen long since, is iniquitous. Why should we allow its economics, however good, to confuse our minds as to the Party's practice of all the oppressions and tyrannies which as Americans and liberals we have hated since first we knew anything? Because a gangster dons a mask of virtue, are we going to applaud him when he gets away with murder? No—the new economic system is not dependent upon Russia's ruthless despotism, nor does it justify in Russia or anywhere else the deeds of violence, terror, and betrayal which have now blossomed to their full flower in the Kremlin. Totalitarianism is the same everywhere—the leopard has the same spots in every jungle! Now that this is clear, it simplifies the picture. Communism and Fascism belong together as the common enemies of mankind. As Hitler's Reich and Stalin's Commintern have now rolled themselves into one, so at any time we may expect Fritz Kuhn's German-American Bund and Earl Browder's Communist Party to do the same. Whether or no, we want nothing of either one of them. They must still be protected in their rights, but together held in the contempt of all free and honest minds.

CHURCH SUPPORT LAGGING

The churches are sharing with the colleges the results of the long economic depression, coupled with that growing indifference to cultural and ethical interests which is so alarmingly characteristic of our time. The churches, however, seem to be somewhat worse off than the colleges and other institutions devoted to the public welfare. Note, for example, the report of the National Committee for Religion and Welfare Recovery which, in coöperation with the Golden Rule Foundation, has been conducting a campaign for increased church attendance. "Our annual income," says the report, "rose from $40,014,000,000 in 1932 (the pit of the depression) to $71,853,000,000 in 1937 (just before the recession), an *increase* of more than 79 per cent. During the same period, contributions as officially reported from twenty-five major church communions and denominations declined from $398,828,514 in 1932 to $314,946,269 in 1937, a *decrease* of more than 21 per cent." These are "sobering facts," says Charles V. Vickery, executive chairman of the committee. They become still more "sobering" when brought into comparison with certain other figures. Thus, it is pointed out by this report that *"more than twice as much* is expended for alcoholic beverages as for churches, and more is annually burned up in the form of cigarettes than is given for the support of all houses of worship, religious education and character-building institutions." If the statistics were added for cosmetics, candies, and the movies, results would be still more astounding. Mr. Vickery refuses to be discouraged by these facts, preferring to believe that they indicate only "a temporary reaction in a forward movement which spans the centuries." We agree with him that there is reaction here—a reaction coincident with the general collapse of economic stability, cultural interest and moral stamina which began with the Great War and has been extending and deepening ever since. But we believe that there is another and profounder fact involved—namely, the struggle of all things spiritual against the besetting materialism of mankind! Churches have never had an easy time of it, nor possessed the whole-hearted devotion of anything like the majority of society. As our age is more than ever materialistic, the religious struggle is more than ever hard. But this, as the brave-hearted Mr. Vickery points out, is not an occasion for despair but "a challenge to action."

Jottings

C. L. Kingsbury, President of the Toy Manufacturers of the U. S. A., has announced that the well-dressed Christmas tree will have no more "war toys" this year than last. But there will be an increase in "toy models" of national defense equipment. How splendid thus to educate the childish mind as to the distinction between defensive and aggressive war!

Credit another triumph to the radio! It has driven from the city streets the "extry, extry" that used to be cried aloud both day and night. Today no "extry" can catch up with the latest terrific news flashed across the spaces of the air.

New biographies of President Taft and President Harding have recently appeared. Both are able and vivid pieces of historical portraiture. Yet, in the lurid light of all that has happened since these men flourished, these stories seem as remote as Suetonius' lives of the Roman emperors.

The Flying Dutchman seems to have disappeared. But Flying Germans still haunt the seas. The *Admiral Scheer,* the *Deutschland,* and now the *Bremen* are among the ghost-ships which the English navy has still to exorcise. Where is there a better place for mystery, or hiding, than the ocean?

When *Forward* (Glasgow) reports that "America is building 9,000 planes" and interprets this to mean that "the U. S. A. is determined to resist any unprovoked aggression on the part of the Eskimos," we get a clear light on how all this preparedness business looks to the European. If anything on this planet is more crazy than anything else, it is the idea that this country is in any danger of attack from abroad.

"My ideal infantryman has the qualities of a successful poacher, cat burglar, and gunman."

Lt. Gen. Sir Archibald Wavell.

Exactly! J. H. H.

The Lessons of a Disillusioned Radicalism

A. STIERNOTTE

The present friendly relations between Fascist Germany and Soviet Russia, dramatized by the several visits of von Ribbentrop to the Kremlin and the conclusion of commercial and diplomatic agreements, are now compelling an unpleasant but necessary "examination of conscience" on the part of many liberals and radicals who had once put their faith in the support given by the Soviets to the collective security system in Western Europe, a collective system reinforced by the struggle for the formation of popular front governments in the more advanced democratic countries.

The very phrase "peace is indivisible" was coined by Maxim Litvinov, and the peace forces of the world were impressed with the good intentions of Russia's foreign minister. At least his good offices in standing by the Covenant of the League of Nations, when the totalitarian countries heaped contempt upon it, was regarded as a decisive factor in the formation of a democratic bloc embracing the Soviet Union, a bloc which would be powerful enough to resist the assaults of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio axis. That was the crux of the policy of the more advanced peace movements with a world-wide significance, such as the League for Peace and Democracy, and the Youth Congress Movement. The distinctive feature of this policy was the belief, almost amounting to a conviction, that Russia was solidly behind the democracies, and therefore the only grave uncertainty was the attitude of the French and British governments, headed by Daladier and Chamberlain. For instance, Professor Harry F. Ward, of Union Theological Seminary, one of the most penetrating analysts of the implications of social forces, said of both the French and British prime ministers:

> Democracy can't be safe so long as these two men and the forces they represent are in power. They will double-cross Russia, and Russia knows that.—*Radical Religion,* Summer 1939.

Now the "irony of history" (to use a phrase of Frederick Engels) is that the Soviets have double-crossed both "these two men and the forces they represent," and it is the much maligned French and British governments which are now bearing the brunt of the battle against Hitlerism! No previous historical development has rendered so futile the prophecies of even the most distinguished social thinkers. And one of the strangest things to be brought to light is that Warsaw in its last days—a second edition of the Paris Commune—was heroically defended by a workers' government—a workers' government finally crushed by a lightning Nazi war, benevolently assisted by the self-styled workers' government of the Soviets! The whole policy of the defense of democracy against Fascism has thus been betrayed by the Soviets, and the name of a great nation which promised to shed new light on international relationships has now become contemptible. No doubt the U. S. S. R. is acting for its own selfish interests, and many factors now hidden in the mysterious moves of the Kremlin will one day be revealed. The hard facts of history have compelled many of her sympathizers to come to no other conclusion but that she is just another selfish nation bent on her own self-aggrandizement at the expense of the larger human unity which seemed to be on the point of emerging. "The light from the East," which seemed to herald a new era in human affairs, is no more!

And what of the Communist movement? A few comments on the history of the labor movement in the last decade are necessary to appreciate the morass in which Communists find themselves.

Previous to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the Communist parties had only one gospel to preach, that of world revolution. Their parties, so they said, were the only ones which knew the laws of social change; all other parties, since they were assumed not to know these laws, were Fascist in tendency. For instance, liberals were social-Fascists, and the leaders of the American Socialist Party were given, on more than one occasion, the choice epithet of Socialist Fascists! It was all as simple as that! William Z. Foster wrote *Towards Soviet America* when perhaps only a dozen people in the United States knew what a "Soviet America" would mean. As far as its immediate relevance to world affairs is concerned, the theory of Sovietism was thus on a par with Einstein's theory! And when Reinhold Niebuhr wrote *Moral Man and Immoral Society,* that epoch-making book which marked the most profound understanding of a Marxist world-outlook on the part of the religious forces of this country—the book was damned by the official Communist press, and why? Simply because it did not agree with every jot and tittle in the writings of the self-appointed interpreters of Marxian orthodoxy! Under this sectarian influence in 1933, or thereabouts, certain groups in the Socialist Party, such as the Militant Socialists and the Revolutionary Program Committee, began to publish statements of extremely leftist policy. There seemed to be a keen rivalry as to which of the four or five Marxist sects would attain the greatest degree of revolutionary purity

through the mouthing of revolutionary phrases. Whether they had any relation to the possibilities of the existing situation did not matter at all. The point taken seemed to be that great social changes are brought about, not through the many-sided experience of millions embracing all the aspects of social life, but through Marxist sects beating the air with jargon only known to themselves.

In Great Britain the same sectarian approach by the Communist Party induced the Independent Labor Party to sever connections with the Labor Party. The I. L. P. was constantly belabored to come "out from among them" and form a united front with the C. P. At that time this meant absorption by the C. P. A few years later, Mr. William Gallagher was elected to the House of Commons and was greatly surprised that the relations between the I. L. P. members and the Labor Party members were extremely hostile. Forsooth, he could not understand it! He should have known that the chief agency which reduced the I. L. P. to a narrow sect was his own party. And so the story goes on—a series of blunders which have cost humanity decades of delayed social progress and the sufferings of millions.

In 1935, however, under the leadership of Georgi Dimitroff, the hero of the Leipsic trials, where the new order and the old order met face to face, a new attitude seemed to have been forged by the extreme-leftists. Dimitroff admitted that what Lenin had called "the infantile sickness of leftism" had become "an ingrained vice" in the Communist parties. At long last Lenin's advice to the "old Bolsheviki" to change their ways because "they thoughtlessly repeated a current formula instead of studying the peculiarities of the new living reality," was profitably absorbed by the new Bolsheviki. The world movement against war and Fascism, initiated in 1932 by Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse (see UNITY for October 3, 1932) was broadened to the extent of receiving a tremendous impetus from the support of liberal elements in every walk of life, whether secular or religious. In Dr. Harry F. Ward, president of the American section, it had secured a man of great intellect, a keen thinker, aware more than anyone else of the many strands of social life which must be drawn together in spite of their diverse approaches into a progressive whole, a unity of liberal and radical movements to preserve and extend the democratic heritage. In the Communist parties themselves, the engine of world revolution was thrown into reverse gear, the popular front became the dominant issue, and French Communists, apparently more pliable than British Communists, went so far as to extend the hand of friendship to French Catholics. This moderation was gladly accepted by many Socialists as bearing the signs of true repentance. In Great Britain, Professors Harold Laski, G. D. Cole, Sir Stafford Cripps and Lord Marley, to name only the outstanding leaders, grew more restive under the reformist policy of the Labor Party and openly took part in united front activities. The *Labour Monthly* was a barometer of the rising tide for a popular front, strongly assisted by the lecture tours of John Strachey who was chiefly responsible for the popularization of ideas which had once been regarded as extremely repugnant. As in the case of the British constitution, social advance was to move "from precedent to precedent," the popular front becoming the melting pot of progressive ideas, the crucible of history in which partial advances were to be extended to greater objectives. And the significant thing about the popular front was that this was to be done not through the propaganda of any extreme sect, but through the fact that men of good will had come to pool their human resources in the effort to readjust their ideals so as to come to closer grips with the social reality that they had made it their business to master.

Such is the background of the labor movement up to the time of the Soviet Union's ignominious rejection of the collective ideal for a pact with the power which had been preached in and out of season as the chief villain of the European drama, Nazi Germany. Those liberals who never put much faith in the U. S. S. R. are not surprised at the turn of events; but those who did are compelled in all honesty to undergo a readjustment of attitudes and loyalties. Is it any wonder that Granville Hicks, former Harvard university instructor, has resigned from the Communist Party in protest against such betrayal? In social no less than in religious movements, the repetition of dead formulas is a baneful influence, although there are still quite a number of extremists with a slavish mentality whose attitude to the U. S. S. R. seems to be: "though it slay me, yet will I trust it." Let no one misunderstand this criticism; it is not a criticism of the popular front or of such broad movements as the American Youth Congress and the League for Peace and Democracy. It is rather a criticism of the sabotage of those who have now delivered to these movements a blow which it is as yet too early to estimate.

What then are the lessons to be drawn from this course of events which cannot but lead to disillusionment on the part of liberals? They may, perhaps, be summarized as follows:

1. No country has a monopoly of the contributions to be made to human civilization. If Sweden has impressed moderates with her coöperative movements; and if Russia has impressed radicals with her socialized medicine, her scientific research, her fight against medievalism and illiteracy, well and good! But one must not jump to the conclusion that anything done by these countries is necessarily relevant or immediately applicable to the American scene. Each nation has its own traditions, culture, and loyalties, and it is in the light of these that social progress can be made. A typically American philosophy, pragmatism, might very well be used to assess the value of progressive politics in the light of their practical results. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

2. No political movement has a monopoly of the contributions to be made to human civilization. Confusion over the disgrace of one Marxist party should not lead to the conclusion that one of the four or five Marxist sects in the United States has the key to human destiny, least of all the fourth internationalists. Marxist philosophy has an intrinsic greatness which will survive the little men who have distorted it, just as Christianity has an intrinsic greatness which has survived the little men who have distorted it. A typically American Marxism, which will gather into itself the achievements of humanity in science, art, literature and religion, seems to be emerging in the writings of Edmund Wilson.

3. There is need of an agency to examine critically, interpret, and assess the many movements which really or ostensibly endeavor to extend human freedom.

Human progress is a many-sided affair, and there is nothing more required at present than a vigorous liberal spirit. Not the old liberalism, which assumed that the nineteenth century order of *laissez-faire* was the high-water mark of human betterment—far from it! But a new liberalism, whose first assumption is that the quest for human values is still—a quest! Men of good will are still necessary to discover anew the conditions of social advance, and once these are ascertained, to devote themselves unreservedly to the ideal of world community. For "the planet" has indeed "come to consciousness" and there can be no turning back.

When one is searching for this critical agency, one is led strangely enough to the possibilities of the Liberal church. It may not be the pivot of history; it is not the chief directive instrument which changes social relations and with them the whole superstructure of society. But its detachment may prove to be its strength. It shall thus refrain from falling into the error of extreme partisanship with the proponents of either Right or Left pet theories. One of its functions will be to keep abreast of the new factors which a complex world order is bound to bring to light, and to interpret in the welter of conflicting ideologies those contributions to the human venture in such a way that men will realize once again that life becomes supremely meaningful when they are linked to their fellows in the consciousness that their values are rooted in the universe.

Trumpets on New Horizons

The Challenge

Who dares to say that the misguided youth
Who fired the fatal bullet which laid low
A chief of Nazidom, is not, in truth,
More of a victim than his murdered foe?
Who could think otherwise, who knoweth aught
Of those reprisals which have taken place
On German soil, where Teuton lords have wrought
Such cruel vengeance on a helpless race,
Whose whole offence was the mere accident
Of birth, for which no blame should be assigned—
A race which, through the centuries, has spent
Itself, in faithful service to mankind.
This is a challenge to all Christendom,
To rescue Israel from the Tyrant's thumb.

KATHERINE FINNIGAN ANDERSON

Forgotten

Another dawn, a bloody sun
Peering through clouds of smoke;
Wan faced and bleary eyed
The factory workers cough and choke,
But with a song, though often faint
They tread the mill of blood and bones
Earning a pittance for meat and bread
And fear-tightened lips emit no groans;
To chafe at delay, or make complaint
Brings on the spectre the poor so dread,
No job at all, no money for rent
Crying children, and charity's bread.
Still churches cant of BROTHERLY LOVE
To a people whose souls are long since dead.

GRADY MCCARTY LONG

The Just War

The Powers on every side parade
Material cannon, to ensure
That immaterial God shall aid
And prove their patriot fervour pure.

There's not a war worth fighting in
But conflict of the single soul,
That more from the slow arduous win
May learn self-mastery, self-control.

Great forces mass on either side
The frontiers of the lonely will,
And there alone shall man decide
The Cosmic trend for good or ill.

GEOFFREY JOHNSON

They Will Not Learn

From the womb of Hate, by the War-God Mars,
Born and reared under evil stars.
Nursed at the Veins of warrior dead,
Devouring the cause for which they bled,

Springs now, full grown, fierce Vengeance' lust,
To crush the world in writhing dust.
Foul henchmen, marching at his side,
Stern visaged, match him stride for stride.

Distrust and Envy, Fear and Greed
Foster and further his dreadful creed.
As the spectre of Death follows hard on their trail,
Grim reaping the harvest of Earth's travail.

And weak humanity tribute pays,
In blood and grief through fear-wracked days
For they will not learn war breeds more war
To destroy the goals they struggle for.

CLINTON RINGGO HULL

Ypres
1919

These fields of bleak white crosses sear my eyes,
These rancid shell holes, reeking with green scum,
Exude a stench that makes me sick and numb,
These filthy dugouts stink like Satan's sties,
Shrieking with sin's demoniacal cries;
While violets in spring delirium
Peep through a skull's eye socket, stark and dumb
And over all gleam gorgeous butterflies.

And so these Big-Wigs, Armament War-Gods
Declared with unction *you* must do your bit
To make democracy quite safe and sound,
With your dear life, as cheap as dust and clods
You paid—and yet World Peace groans in the pit,
And man like Gulliver still bites the ground.

EDWIN BARLOW EVANS

Refugee Facts

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER

The humanitarian sympathies of Americans regarding the refugee problem have often been affected by the realistic fear of what it will do to increase our own already grave economic problems. Fears are nearly always the result of ignorance of the truth. And it seems that our misapprehensions have been largely groundless, first regarding the numbers of refugees, secondly regarding their displacement of American workers.

In a booklet recently published and circulated among a limited group, the American Friends Service Committee have summarized the problem in a brief but thorough manner, with graphic statistics.

The Friends have had long experience in dealing with refugees and with the backwash of war. Their policy of ignoring political, racial, and other prejudices when human beings need help is well known. It was estimated that for four years following the World War the Friends Service Committee fed a maximum of 1,200,000 children a day in Germany. Ten years later, in the winter of 1930, in a little suburb of Vienna in which we lived, we found that this service had not been forgotten. I was deeply impressed with the universal respect and admiration that the Quaker child-feeding mission had left behind them. On the orphanage in the village, a tablet had been erected, commemorating the service of the Friends, and my landlady was one of the many who commented on the thousands of children's lives that had been saved by the timely and efficient service rendered when no other organization was willing or prepared to help.

When persecution of minority groups in Germany began under the present regime, the Friends again responded. They assisted not only with relief but they attempted to help those who were forced to leave Germany and go to other parts of the world. It is one of several organizations offering a service of hospitality and placement for those refugees who can enter this country under our immigration law. They believe that if American organizations are wise and careful in their placement, these refugees will prove a valuable asset to our community life. But the Friends in their work have encountered grave misunderstanding of the refugee problem, and because of it they have directed attention to the following enlightening facts.

It seems that under the quota regulations established in 1924 and amended in 1929, only 153,774 immigrants are allowed to come to this country annually. Of this number 83,574 is the quota assigned to Great Britain and Ireland, which in the year ending June, 1938, used only 4,551 of their total. Thus immigration has been limited to approximately 75,000 annually.

The committee finds that between the years 1932 and 1938, a total of 241,962 immigrants were admitted into the United States for permanent residence but during this same period 246,449 immigrants previously admitted moved away. Thus during the six-year period which roughly approximates the years of the Nazi regime in Germany 4,487 more aliens departed than were admitted. Although only 241,962 immigrants were admitted during this period, the quota laws actually permitted a total legal immigration of 922,644. Fifty per cent of those admitted during this period were children under eighteen, persons past forty-five, and married women. These figures are peculiarly interesting in view of the fear of numbers of foreign industrial workers coming in to displace our own workers and to lower our standard of living.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the year of the largest refugee immigration, there was a net immigration into this country for permanent residence of only 42,685, less than a third of the legal permitted quota. The high point of post-war immigration was reached in 1924 with 630,107. In 1929, the last year before the depression, the immigration amounted to 210,475. Thus in 1938 the immigration was one-fifth that of 1929 and one-fifteenth that of 1924. Based on a population of 130,000,000, the 1938 net immigration to this country represented less than four one-hundredths of one per cent of our population.

German refugees have increased in number from 1,919 in the year 1932-1933 to 17,199 in the year 1937-1938. The total immigration from greater Germany between 1932 and 1938 was 45,952. But during this period, 22,362 aliens, presumably here for permanent residence, left this country for Germany.

This country has been the haven for political refugees for the past 300 years so that there is little new in the story of persecution and exodus of minorities from Germany. The United States is receiving today a small but complex group of refugees from greater Germany who may roughly be divided into two classes. First there are those Germans who have incurred the hatred of the Nazi regime by their championship of liberalism, democracy, and international coöperation. These were formerly the political and intellectual leaders under the German Republic, Democrats, moderate Socialists and pacifists, liberal professors, journalists, Catholic priests and Protestant pastors, some of the finest intellectual representatives of democratic Germany.

A larger class, however, is that of the victims of the new National Socialist racial laws. These are the famous laws enacted to purge Germany of all Jewish blood. Under them anyone is a "Jew" who has even at little as 25 per cent Jewish blood in his veins, no matter what his religious affiliation is. Some of those labelled "Jews" by the Nazis have no Jewish blood at all but because of marriage to a Jew they are officially registered as such.

It is generally thought by the average American that nearly all refugees from Germany are Jews by religion. This is far from true. In 1938 about one-third (31 per cent) of all refugees from Germany were Christians. In the years before, the proportion was higher. And the proportion of Christians among those who are still in Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia but would like to leave, is still higher. Jewish organizations in this country were first in the field to assist their co-religionists to emigrate and that is the reason for the larger proportion of Jewish refugees arriving on our shores, a proportion amounting to approximately five Jews to two Christians.

There are organizations and individuals in the United States who unfortunately prey upon ignorant and uninformed people with anti-foreign and anti-Semitic propaganda. The American Friends Service Committee feels that the fear in the minds of many Americans that refugees will displace American workers should be met with the truth and with intelligent assistance to the newcomers.

Because of stringent regulations of the Nazi regime

the refugees, through no fault of their own, arrive here with almost no money and necessarily need help in establishing themselves. Some are fitted only for trades and professions which along the eastern seaboard are already overcrowded. These need shifting to less crowded areas or should be re-trained for occupations needing applicants. The American Friends Service Committee reminds us that every human being is a consumer and that the refugee too has wants to be supplied by American businesses and factories. Many of these refugees are intellectuals of the first rank, capable of making a valuable contribution to our cultural life. Some will bring new businesses and skills to our country, and many of the things we used to import from Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia can now be made here by Americans working with trained immigrants.

England has already profited by the 11,000 German immigrants who have entered Great Britain and who have provided work for 15,000 workers.

The American Friends Service Committee feels that common sense and decency demand that not a single American workingman who needs the work and is satisfactory should lose his employment in favor of a refugee. Small and irresponsible employers have taken advantage of the situation but the Friends have discovered that all of the committees and large employers facing the problem are clear in their thinking, realizing the dangers of following any method of employment for refugees which would displace American labor. Other occupations where there will be no displacement must be found. The solution, the Friends feel, will not be difficult, and our refugee problem will be solved to the benefit of all concerned if each American community will contribute a little energy, ingenuity, and good will.

What We Can Do About It

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

Everywhere anxious and disillusioned men and women are today asking: "Is there anything we can do about it?" A pathetic sense of helplessness has settled upon millions in our so-called Christian world as they face the actuality of a second World War within their own generation, and such a situation cannot be met with either romantic optimism nor with caustic cynicism. Nothing will be gained by burying our heads in the sand of our despair, nor will anything vital result from a shallow optimism that every so often explodes into Pollyanna phrases and shibboleths. It would seem to me, that one of the things most needful for our generation is the willingness to face hard facts fearlessly and honestly, and if we are brave enough to do that we may have to face this stark fact, among others, viz: that there really is very little that we can do about it.

Surely every person of intelligence and a sense of moral responsibility will agree that this is not the moment to expect a miracle by some *deus ex machina* intervention in our mundane affairs. If a day of such miracles ever existed, it seems to have passed beyond hope of recall. But to admit that nothing dramatic or spectacular can be achieved in the way of bringing our world back to peace and sanity does not imply by any means that nothing can be done about it. On the contrary, I firmly believe that in this hour of human confusion and dismay we must recognize the obvious fact that, while nothing great and immediately decisive, nothing startling and stupendous can be done, nevertheless certain little things can be done; and if we are at all honest with ourselves, if we have any capacity for self-examination, it may well be that this realization will help us find a way out of humanity's present terrible dilemma. We have become so accustomed to asking for signs from heaven, so used to speaking in large terms, so inured to display and theatre that the very suggestion of doing something little, something apparently insignificant, appears to us as an insult to our sense of human dignity. Have we not the promise that our faith shall move mountains? Yes, but we may not have such a faith.

Before setting forth the little things we not only can but must do, let me briefly outline some of the big things we most certainly cannot afford to do. (1). We cannot afford to sanction and consecrate this war as we did the one twenty-five years ago; that war was not a "war to make the world safe for Democracy," nor was it "a war to end all wars"; and this war is not a war for justice, for security, against aggression, for freedom and what-have-you. As Christians we must condemn this war as just another proof of the unregenerate and unrepentant mind of our Christian civilization. (2). We cannot preach hatred as we did in 1914-1918, for hatred always becomes a boomerang that destroys him who hurled it. (3). We cannot expect this war to settle any profound international issue. It will do this no more than the last war settled anything. (4). We cannot wax fat and smug on the blood and misery of other people. (5). We cannot simply sit back and wash our hands of the whole affair, nor can we afford to pass complacent judgment upon a crime in which we as a people are also involved.

Refusing to do the big things, shall we have the character and courage to do the little things? It is necessary that we at once summon sufficient humility and daring to do these things: (1). We can be contrite and humble in assuming part-responsibility for the catastrophe that has engulfed the world. (2). We can try to control our passions and feelings and to discipline and redirect our intelligence and reason in a situation where "emoting" at the expense of calm thinking inevitably leads to disaster. (3). We can do our share in supporting the program of every bona fide peace organization and in working toward the unifying of all peace action in behalf of the objective of a just peace. (4). We can mobilize our material resources for aid and comfort to all victims of the war monster. We can refuse to furnish implements that take and break human life, while offering every instrument that gives and preserves life. (5). We can bend every honest effort to preserve and extend Democracy within our own land, we can coöperate with the forces of Democracy in other neutral lands, while

freedom and democratic institutions are being ruthlessly destroyed in the warring countries. By so doing, we can help make our land a haven of refuge and an asylum of freedom for that day when again the peoples of the world will turn their weary but hopeful eyes towards the mountains from whence their help shall come. (6). We can retain our faith in that "Divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will," and we can rekindle the altar upon which the flames of our faith in Man have been almost extinguished.

"But these are such trifling and little things," the impatient fanatic, the cynic, and skeptic will say. "We must do something big, something radical, and we must do it now, or all is lost." And to these I say: "There once was an ancient prophet who in his disillusionment and perplexity waited for a revelation of the Divine Will; and it came, but not in the mighty storm, nor in the terrible earthquake, nor in the majestic fire, but in the still, small voice." May it not be wise for us to recognize that in these stirring days God expects of his children first of all that they listen to the still, small voice that speaks of little duties, simple tasks, immediate responsibilities, and asks us to assume these humbly and willingly?

That Word Neutrality

O. A. HAMMAND

Both the Allies and the central powers wanted our munitions, our merchandise, and our food-stuff in 1914. But war was on in the world. And war entirely changes the basis of our civilization, immediately prohibiting certain activities and activities in certain localities, and permitting and requiring different things to be done or done in a different way.

In peacetime everybody recognizes the right of the individual to buy and sell, and approves his acts and commends his enterprise as an economic necessity and a useful service to society. But how different it is in war. In war we run squarely up against that word neutrality. And what is neutrality? It is a technical term in international law defining what a peaceful nation may and may not do in connection with and relation to other nations who are engaged in war. The trouble is that neutrality is difficult to define and more difficult to observe.

During the first eleven months of the World War two thousand American ships were stopped on the seas and dragged into British ports and detained until whatever the British needed had been taken off and then allowed to continue on their trip. But more offensive were the attacks on our ships by German submarines. America insisted on her right to trade, and Germany on January 31, 1917, handed us a note which reviewed the situation and stated that any ships met in or around the zone of Great Britain, France, or Italy, or in the Eastern Mediterranean on their way to England or France, would be sunk. This put the matter straight up to America. The exact legal status is difficult to determine but as a practical situation, it was for us to stop the trade or take the risk. We chose the latter. Things went to the bad rapidly, and on April 6, 1917, Congress declared war.

Senator Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin voted against the war and made a speech at St. Paul, Minnesota, on September 20, 1917, in which he stated that the *Lusitania* was carrying munitions and thereby violating the very rule of neutrality on which it was depending for immunity from attack. This declaration incensed some members of the Senate, who declared that it was not true, so they filed a charge against La Follette for disloyalty and asked to have him expelled from the Senate. Maybe the other Senators did not know but La Follette did know. He always knew his facts, and he began to get ready for trial. When Dudley Malone, Collector of Customs at the Port of New York, offered to testify, and stated that La Follette was right and that the *Lusitania* was carrying munitions, the Senate backed down, dismissed the charge, and passed a resolution to reimburse La Follette for his expense in preparing for trial.

If the Senate had pressed Senator La Follette they would have received this list of merchandise, which was filed in the Senate and printed in the Congressional Record, Vol. 53, Part I, Page 644, on January 7 1916. For the city of Liverpool there was consigned copper, castings, cutlery, oil, leather, steel, iron, aluminum; and shoes, rubber, wire, and salt. There were also listed these particular items:

Military Goods	189 packages,	Value,	$66,221
Ammunition	1271 cases,		47,624
Bronze Powder	50 cases,		1,000

For the city of London the list included wool yarn, leather, shoes, and

Bronze Powder	16 cases,	Value,	$ 687
Cartridges	89 cases,		31,517

Any discussion, so far as its practical value is concerned is, of course, contingent on the supposition that we agree on the definition of neutrality. But this is very difficult. Is neutrality economic, military, political, religious, or psychological? Is it related to time or place,—does it mean that we are impartial or indifferent; may we have ideas and express them or must we keep our minds a blank?

Neutrality under the old international law was not made by a legislative body, nor agreed to by any council of nations. It was merely a rule of war which one nation had imposed on another nation. It was in no sense a rule of peace but absolutely a rule of war. Now we are trying to use a rule of war to keep us out of war.

Let us identify the thing that is usually called neutrality and attempt to show it in its proper place in the picture. Consider three possible phases of national attitude: first, the old idea of neutrality, otherwise known as the freedom of the seas, which was in fact economic participation in war. Next, legislative neutrality, which is a partial renunciation of our right to engage in some other nation's war and to that extent a limitation on our sovereignty. But it is an arbitrary rule which we expect other nations to observe, though they were not consulted and never agreed to it in principle. The third possible phase is coöperation with other nations to enact and enforce international law. The fear of what may happen in active coöperation is always present, but the fear of a policy of drift-

ing may not be appreciated. It may not be entirely accurate to say that the policy of drifting brought on the war of 1939, but it is certainly true that it did not prevent it.

Legislative neutrality may appear in many forms but any form is dangerous. Why? Because it is a rule that applies only in time of war; and when war is on, any nation is liable to be involved. If a nation wants to be safe it must prevent war, not just try to keep out of it. The only real way to prevent war is to organize the world on a basis of law, order, and justice, and then stand back of the law and enforce it.

This of course will require every nation to recognize a limitation on its national sovereignty; the acceptance of a mechanism for legislation, mediation, arbitration, and litigation; and the willingness to enforce the decree by the use of sanctions. There is no less reason why nations should observe rules of law and order than that individuals should observe rules of law and order. It must be acknowledged that if any procedure for law enforcement is once started no one can be sure where it will stop. But if it is known that sanctions in a fair and reasonable manner will be applied, is it not likely to retard the actions of the law-breaker? Sanctions are not alliances nor power politics, but are the enforcement of a rule of law arrived at by a responsible and impartial body of disinterested persons or states after a careful examination of the facts.

One policeman cannot enforce sanctions and one nation cannot enforce sanctions, but the laws of a land with the judicial and civil machinery of justice can enforce sanctions, and the united group of nations in the world in collective action can enforce sanctions. If the enforcing group is not superior or is only slightly superior in strength to the criminal or outlaw, the attempt to enforce is not likely to be orderly enforcement, but is more likely to result in violence or, in the case of nations, to result in war. In order to enforce the law against an individual or against a nation there should be behind the law and back of the law enough authority and enough power so that the offender will not resist.

The world, like the state, must either stop the bank robber, the kidnapper, and the murderer, or else let him go ahead with his activities. This is the alternative. Which is better and less dangerous? Without adequate coöperation the use of sanctions is perhaps more dangerous, but with full or general coöperation a nation will soon learn, as individuals have already learned, that there is a law and that it does not pay to violate it.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor*]

IV

Dr. Russell Bowie, late rector of Grace Church, New York, and now professor at the Union Theological Seminary, spoke the following in his installation address at the Seminary:

> Here I too must record my conviction that, like Canon Raven, and like the radiant and beloved and lost Dick Sheppard, I believe that the Christian gospel can only be most significant, and that after the horror into which these years may deepen the world may only find the nucleus of its salvation, in those who against every pressure, not only from without but from their own instincts, resist the drive toward war; and, in the face of every contradiction, keep faith with their belief that the follower of Jesus simply cannot take part in the bestiality of modern war. I believe that only through those who will thus pay the price of war-resistance, can the power of Jesus most surely operate tomorrow, if not today. God forbid that any of us should minimize the difficulties, logical and spiritual, in such a conviction. God forbid too that there should be any self-righteousness in it, or any shadow of condemnation for Christians who take a different attitude. But there are times when the future must be saved by those who are willing to be a remnant, and by those who take a position which to the majority may seem not only irrational but hateful, because they are constrained to say: "Here I stand. God help me, I can do no other."

The conference of Episcopalians in New York on "Our Christian Duty in the Present Crisis," adopted the following statement now published:

> We acknowledge a deep sense of penitence for the failure of the church and of Christians everywhere in not having done more to prevent war and to promote peace. We are called to repentance and prayer—prayer that is inclusive and never divisive, and that guards against the propaganda of passion which foments nationalistic hatreds.
>
> We believe that this country can make its best contribution toward an ultimate peace of justice and freedom by refusing to become a belligerent, by strengthening such legislation as may be proposed, to prevent the growth of inflated war industries, and by laboring continuously for the cessation of war, and the establishment of a lasting peace.
>
> We believe that the nations which are committed to the defense of democracy should formulate explicitly the conditions on which they hold a just peace might be built; and we urge our own government to formulate a program of international reorganization into which we as a people may engage for the correction of causes which breed war.
>
> We believe that during the conflict we should maintain in every possible way, the international fellowship of the church; and that local parishes should provide quietness and confidence in the midst of confusion, and should promote these foregoing convictions in a strong fellowship of those who in spite of differences can work together because of the common loyalty we all have in Christ.
>
> In the disastrous event that this country should go to war, we hold that the full sympathy and protection of the church should be given to those whose Christian conscience forces them to refuse to have a part in it; and recognizing that men will differ in their judgments, we affirm the supreme conviction that our ultimate choices as citizens of any nation must be held subject to our obedience to what we believe would be the way of Christ.
>
> Be it therefore *Resolved* that this conference appeal to the House of Bishops, in its meeting shortly to be held, to reaffirm the position stated in its Pastoral Letter of 1933 and restated in its Pastoral Letter of 1934 as follows: "The love of country must be qualified by love of all mankind; patriotism is subordinate to religion. The cross is above the flag. In any issue between the country and God, the duty of the Christian is to put obedience to God above every other loyalty.
>
> "War is murder on a colossal scale, and in relation to it the Christian Church cannot and will not deny loyalty and fealty to its Lord."

The Council of Christian Pacifist Groups in England has issued a message to Christian Pacifists, which has been widely circulated. It says:

> It is manifest that in these last days a spirit vastly different from that of 1914 has been revealed. Many in all nations, if they are not yet ready for the renunciation of their lust for power and reliance on violence, are deeply convinced of the wickedness and folly of war; of its destruction of all the true values of life; of its challenge to the personal and ecumenical claims of Christ's religion. There is amongst Christians in Britain and in all lands a clear consciousness of the shame of our present conflicts, a recognition of the judgment which they involve upon our whole method of living, a respect for those who, on grounds of conscience, cannot consent to take any part in military activity, a belief that the real issues at stake are not those of the flesh but of the spirit. Whatever the outcome in terms of national victory or defeat, the issue will be determined by the extent to which the fruit of the Spirit is fostered or corrupted. We believe that today this conviction is felt far outside the ranks of the professed pacifists.
>
> Far from supposing that our work as Christian pacifists can be suspended or from accepting a sense of despair or of the helplessness of our state, we must see in the present calamity a fresh and urgent call to our ministry of reconciliation. We must devote ourselves from the outset to stopping this terrible conflict and helping to bring true peace to the world. A new consecration of ourselves to God, a new insight into the cost and the victory of Calvary, a new sympathy with the whole family of God's human children should be our constant intention for ourselves and for all whom we can touch.
>
> It was in the violence and persecution of the Roman Empire that the faith of Christ achieved its first and most splendid victories; it is when nation rises against nation and men's hearts are failing them for fear that we are bidden to look for the coming of the Son of Man in glory. In the strength of his faith we would rededicate ourselves in our discipleship.

The message is signed by Professor Charles E. Raven, the Reverend Henry Carter, and Professor G. H. C. Macgregor.

The *Christian Pacifist* of England publishes the following resolution of the World Alliance:

> The World Alliance having already on three occasions (in 1924, 1931, 1935) affirmed its convictions with regard to the treatment of conscientious objectors,
>
> And having observed with satisfaction that the legal position of conscientious objectors has been more or less adequately safeguarded in certain countries,
>
> Nevertheless finds it necessary at this serious crisis in international affairs to call attention to the grave danger that increasing political tension may diminish the tolerance accorded by legislation and by public opinion to those who are constrained by conscience to refuse to take any active part in war or in warlike preparations.
>
> The Alliance therefore urges that such conscientious objection on the part of individuals be fully respected, both by Christian congregations and by governmental authorities.
>
> Our appeal to Christian congregations to respect and to try to help these men is based upon the undoubted fact that many of them are moved by a sincere desire to serve Christ.
>
> Our appeal to Governments is based upon the honour due to every man's conscience.
>
> We respectfully request all Governments to establish for conscientious objectors a civilian service, a service which can in no manner be employed for military ends, but which is effectively useful to the community.

Peace news from England is slow to come in, but it comes—as witness the following:

> The Peace Pledge Union added 2,435 new members to its rolls in September, and 1,194 in the first half of October. This is the society organized on the basis of the Dick Sheppard pledge: "I renounce war, and I will never support or sanction another."
>
> In the conscription registry at the opening of the war, 16 per cent of the Cambridge students enrolled as conscientious objectors.
>
> A recent issue of the *Peace News* reports "stop the war" meetings in various parts of the British Isles, and public appeals for an immediate peace conference signed by many notables.

A United Press dispatch from London reports the following:

> A disabled World War soldier's description of war as "filthy and contemptible" provoked a storm of applause from the spectators in a London court today.
>
> The veteran was testifying in support of his son's application for immunity from army service as a conscientious objector. When the applause he received swelled to a general uproar, the judge ordered the court cleared in order to continue the case in private.
>
> Many refused to leave, among them several women. They set up a chant: "Dictatorship! We want a fair deal! This shouldn't be done behind closed doors!" The protestants dispersed only after the conscientious objectors whose cases were being heard sent a deputation to appeal to them to "leave quietly so the cases may be dealt with."
>
> Bedlam broke out during testimony in the case of Thomas Jack Law, an unemployed clerk. His father was called to the stand at the youth's request to tell of his experiences in the World War.
>
> "War is filthy and contemptible," the father began. "After suffering in a hospital for five years, two of them on my back and being fed by other people, I determined that if I ever got out I would instruct my son under no conditions whatever to participate in such filthy, dirty work.
>
> "I volunteered because I had a farm in Canada, and they said I was there to protect it from the Germans. But after I came back I found it wasn't the Germans but the people I had gone to fight for against whom I needed protection."
>
> Applause shook the courtroom, growing steadily in volume, resulting in the order to clear the room.

At a meeting held on October 12, the St. Lawrence Theological School (Universalist) student body voted by a large majority to go on record as refusing to support any war engaged in by the United States government. The school is in Canton, New York.

At the Fifth National Catechetical Congress of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (Roman Catholic), meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, Archbishop Frank J. L. Beckman of Dubuque, Iowa, said:

> Catholics must give serious thought to the question of whether or not they should be conscientious objectors to American participation in war abroad. . . . We must forestall any propaganda that is intended to arouse our youth to warlike attitude.

The *New Leader* (London), organ of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain, reports the following:

> "I would regard my expulsion from the Labor Party as an honor."
>
> This declaration was made by Bailie T. A. Kerr, senior magistrate of Glasgow, at a crowded anti-war meeting in St. Andrew's Hall.
>
> Bailie Kerr said that had anyone told him six months ago that the Labor Party would be urging young men into the army he would not have believed it.

Adventure

Man's
untamed
wilderness
is man's greedy
self.

LLOYD FRANK MERRELL

The Spirit Behind the Nazi German Empire

TARAKNATH DAS

With the advent of the German-Polish War, which has developed into a new Napoleonic War, in which Hitler's Germany has taken the place of Napoleon's France, many people are forced to think more seriously of the spirit behind Nazi Germany. Lately many books have been published on this subject, three of which are indispensable for a thorough and clear understanding of the attitude of Germany's internal problems, Christianity, and international relations.

Dr. Hermann Rauschning, a former leader of the Nazi Party and ex-president of the Danzig Senate, in his work *The Revolution of Nihilism*,[1] gives a revealing interpretation of Naziism, which he characterizes primarily as a revolutionary movement whose object is to destroy the old order and the old values; and to acquire, by any means, supreme power for party leaders. To attain this objective, various policies have been adopted, in violation of all moral and ethical concepts and solemn promises of Nazi leaders. Nazi leaders advocate the crushing of any force—spiritual or cultural, social or economic, external or international—which may even attempt to check the march of this revolution. Thus the author thinks that in the Nazi Revolution there is no constructive feature whatsoever, but it builds up and acquires weapons of mass support, industrial reorganization, military machinery, and international contacts or pacts to gain its ends. One of the causes of the rise of Naziism is the utter inability and unscrupulousness of the German ruling class which surrendered to Naziism, with the hope that the Nazi movement might later on be overthrown. But Naziism, instead of being overthrown by the ruling class, has established itself in its place. Among other things, Dr. Rauschning has vividly described the aims of the Nazi Revolution and its foreign policy.

In the work, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church*,[2] by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, a Protestant scholar of distinction, we have a very careful study of the nature and development of the conflict between the Church and the State in Nazi Germany. Every paragraph of this book is documented by reliable source material, pronouncements of Nazi leaders, and other literature. It reveals that the conflict between Church and State in Germany lies not merely in the field of influence of the Church over its members, but is rooted in two divergent views on every moral and ethical problem of life. The Church believes in the sanctity of individual life, truth, and justice, as well as liberty, whereas to the National Socialist Party everything however sacred must be sacrificed before the altar of *party interest*. One of the most prominent Nazi leaders, Dr. Hans Frank, has declared: "only that which the National Socialist Party recognizes as right is right." As Herr Hitler's orders and actions are the guiding principles of the Party and are beyond criticism by any National Socialist, the Nazi State cannot brook the existence of any organization which may claim moral authority to challenge Herr Hitler's absolute and undisputed supremacy. From the National Socialist point of view, Herr Hitler is the agent of God; and the National Socialist Party centers are the new churches which are to inculcate the new religion of state-worship. Therefore, it is inevitable that the fight against Judaism will be followed by the fight against Catholicism and against the German church of the Protestant Christians. If Hitlerism is to survive, then it must crush the moral authority of the Church and thus the unholy struggle must continue. But Herr Hitler and the Nazi leaders are clever enough to hide their real objective and preach that they are not against religion or Christianity, but that they are carrying on a campaign to destroy political religious institutions which interfere with the fulfillment of the mission of the National Socialist Movement and the regeneration of Germany.

The Nazis have adopted various means to dispossess the Catholic Church of its land and wealth. They are persecuting the priests and nuns, and doing their best to alienate the children of the Church upon whom the future primarily rests. Will the Nazis win victory over religion—especially over the Roman Catholic Church and Christianity? Once Signor Mussolini in the pages of the Paris *Figaro* offered a significant warning to Herr Hitler in the following manner:

> The whole history of western civilization from the time of the Roman Empire to the present day, from Diocletian to Bismarck, teaches us that whenever there is a conflict between the State and religion it is always the State that loses the battle. A battle against religion is a battle against the imponderable. It is open warfare against the spirit, at the point where the spirit is deepest and most inward. It is proven today that in the course of such a battle even the sharpest weapons at the disposal of the State are ineffectual mortally to wound the Church. The Church, and more especially the Catholic Church, emerges from the bitterest battles unchanged and victorious.

With the recent alliance of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, two states wedded to the ideals of totalitarianism and state-worship, the conflict between Church and State is bound to be pushed forward by the forces against God and religion. Those who are interested in upholding religion and religious institutions should study the work of Dr. Micklem to get an inside view of this conflict.

In the book, *The New German Empire*,[3] Dr. Franz Borkenau primarily discusses Nazi Germany's foreign policies. The policy of expansion, championed by the Nazis, forces them to muster economic power which cannot be achieved without raw materials and control of markets. But the Nazi system of economics forces them to adopt political control over states which are to be brought within the Nazi orbit. This demands military preparedness and undue development of armament industries.

> Thus rearmament, undertaken partly as a miraculous device against all evils of unemployment and partly as a means of enhancing Germany's power and prestige, does in its turn create a real need for more power and for the control of greater economic resources. It is a vicious circle where the desire for conquest produces the need for conquest.

Germany's real aim is to create a vast empire on the ruins of Britain and France. Professor Haushofer, a most influential political thinker, whose geo-politi-

[1] *The Revolution of Nihilism—Warning to the West.* By Hermann Rauschning, (Alliance Book Corporation). 300 pp. New York: Longmans Green and Company. $3.00.

[2] *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church.* By Nathaniel Micklem. 243 pp. New York: Oxford University Press. $3.00.

[3] *The New German Empire.* By Franz Borkenau. 167 pp. New York: The Viking Press. $2.00.

cal ideas have influenced the foreign policies of Nazi Germany, believes that Germany must expand on a continental scale first, and then act towards the fulfillment of wider aims of oceanic expansion.

In summing up the nature of the German expansionist policy, the author says:

> Two facts are outstanding. German expansion is unlimited in its aims; it moves in the direction of the weakest resistance much more than in the direction of some definite object. But its final aim is world domination. . . .

The totalitarian Nazi State "in the long run cannot put up with the existence of a democratic country. The breaking of the power of Britain, France, and the United States is therefore her main aim." The author further believes that eventually Naziism is bound to collapse:

> It is impossible to say how far the Fascist world revolution will go. But it is certain that its heirs will not again be Fascist. Even if Nazi Germany sweeps half the world or more, she will in the end collapse, owing to her inherent instability. She would then have been the pacemaker for some other regime not yet discernible.

The Study Table

Book Notes

INDIANS OF THE AMERICAS. *By Edwin R. Embree.* 260 *pp. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company.* $2.75.

That the author of this work is genuinely interested in race and culture, and has acquired a real appreciation of diverse peoples, is evident from the temper in which he brings to life the civilizations of the ancient Americans. Deserving of special mention is the Pan-American manner in which the subject is treated. After disposing of various myths regarding Indian origins, Mr. Embree brings the bronze race to the Americas by way of Bering Strait. Then follow the two main sections of the book dealing with "The Classic Indian Cultures," and "North American Indian Life." The author is rightly concerned about the problem of preserving the positive advantages of diversity in "this rapidly shrinking world." The book contains a number of attractive and illuminating drawings, and there is a good index.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

MATRIMONIAL SHOALS. *By Royal D. Rood.* 424 *pp. Detroit: Detroit Law Book Company.* $3.50.

Wherein it laboriously appears that the chief cause of increase in the divorce rate is the development of civilized welfare laws, which take away from the "breadwinner" his rightful authority in the home as it once existed under common law; and which give the woman possible financial gains in asserting her independence. The remedy: Back to common law, and away with social workers! A good example of a bad book.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

BEYOND THE SENSES. *By Charles Francis Potter.* 278 *pp. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company.* $2.50.

In Charles Francis Potter, the theory of extra sensory perception has acquired a convert who knows how to write clearly and interestingly. Moreover, he is experienced and skillful in debate, and knows how to state both the affirmative and the negative points of view so that the issue is well defined. While *Beyond the Senses* is not intended for purposes of debate, it is nevertheless quite frankly the work of an advocate—but not that of an uncritical advocate. Although genuinely appreciative of the Duke experiments, Dr. Potter submits them to a critical analysis hardly surpassed by those who are scientifically skeptical of extra sensory perception. At no point does the author resort to the supernatural for explanation of the mysterious. He follows through with the assumption that the realm of the natural is not bounded by the five senses. From all that is herein, and elsewhere, set forth by honest and intelligent people, it would appear that we are reduced to the choice of accepting extra sensory experience as a fact or of revising considerably our previously held conception of the laws of probability. I myself, being somewhat inexperienced in the realm of higher psychic and mathematical matters, am resolved to await further developments before attempting to use the extra sensory method of knowing what has gone before or predicting what is yet to come. Meantime, however, I shall try to keep an open mind—and yet not so open that it will refuse to close on incontrovertible evidence, should such appear.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

HOW TO PSYCHOANALYZE THE BIBLE. *By H. F. Haas.* 116 *pp. Orangeburg, S. C.: Haas Publication Committee, Box* 424. $1.00.

In which it appears that much of the trouble of our world is due to "theistic complexes" arising from anthropomorphic theological teachings and symbols.

CURTIS W. REESE

A Jewish Commentary

THE BOOK OF PSALMS. A COMMENTARY. *By Solomon B. Freehof. Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.* 414 *pp.* $2.50.

This is the book we have long been awaiting, a commentary on the Psalms which is inspired both by sound scholarship and by true piety. It is the beginning of a series of commentaries on the Bible, and let us hope the following volumes will live up to this splendid example. The author, Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, is well-known as the author of *Stormers of Heaven.* He was at one time Professor of Rabbinics and Liturgy and is now pastor of a congregation. These experiences produce the learning and the piety.

This commentary is of especial value to Christian scholars for another reason: it makes full use of the learning of the Talmud, the Targum, and the Jewish commentators such as Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, and others. For a complete and useful knowledge of the Psalms, this scholarship must be used. But the Talmud and the Jewish Fathers are for the most part closed books to Christians.

The entire religious world will always be interested in the Psalms. Here in these timeless hymns, Jews and Christians meet. The high literary style gives this book an additional charm.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Christianity and Peace

Editor of UNITY:

The article in UNITY of October 16 by Philip S. Bernstein is a very interesting contribution to the cause of modern thought. Particularly interesting to religious thought is his reference to Will Durant's fear concerning the future of the religious movement known as historic Christianity. Professor Durant shares this fear with many thousands of the followers of the theology of St. Paul. It is well to keep in mind that popular Christianity is not based on the teachings of Jesus but on St. Paul's doctrine of the fall of man in a mythical garden, which is not an historical fact and was never mentioned either by Jesus or the twelve apostles. Jesus was a Jew, lived the life of a Jew, died a Jew, and never was a Christian.

What is the disturbing factor in the situation today that causes such grave fear concerning the future of Christianity? Jesus the peacemaker is forgotten, and Christianity sings "Onward Christian Soldiers," literally, with sword in hand and battleships and bombing planes. Christian nations hold sway and power over conquered nations, over peoples unable to repel the tyranny of the usurpers. But science is knocking at the doors of modern institutions and challenging the false theology of a bygone age. There have been in the past, noble souls, men and women, and there are now, amid all the blunders and errors, men and women inspired by the desires for peace and justice. Years ago Samuel Longfellow said "Human is a broader word than Christian," for it voices the hopes and aspirations of humanity, free from the superstitions of the past.

E. H. BARRETT

Lansing, Michigan.

Christian Action

Editor of UNITY:

Karl Marx said that the philosophers had explained the world for centuries but that he proposed to change it. The Christian religion has been explaining the world for two thousand years, but wars, exploitation, and oppression remain as ever. The Communist Party through its organizational methods does have a formula for changing the world rather than explaining it.

In view of the Christian aims and ideals there could be no imitation of Communist Party tactics, but there could be, on the part of those Christians anxious to change the world, a working group similar to the Communist group. If such a group were to come out for union organization, decent politics, or anti-dictatorship ideas there would be much work for it.

When people think of churches nowadays they think of Sunday school lessons, and festivals. They do not think of the church as a means of actually changing the world in any immediate practical way. That is left to secular agencies often with much poorer morals and methods than a Christian group would use.

The church is always lamenting the state of the world, the city, and the nation. If it really wants to do something about it, instead of discussing matters, it must actually organize for Christian action on the home front for actual political and social work. It is difficult to understand how a Christian world can come about just by preaching one sermon a week and hearing a Sunday school lesson.

CARL PETERSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 102)

ploit the widespread belief that America was brought into the last war, not, *as was the actual fact,* by her conviction that the safety of the whole world demanded the defeat of Prussian militarism, but by the intrigues of financiers and industrialists interested in an allied victory." And then, after coolly throwing history into the ash can, the *Times* insists that it is for American opinion to decide. "For us in this country to endeavor to take part in the argument could only do infinite mischief."

For weeks the British press has been filled with anxious columns and sensational news items about the possibility of a violation of Dutch and Belgian neutrality by German troops and airplanes. But the *News Review,* British imitation of the American weekly *Time,* publishes a map showing how British bombing planes could reach strategic German frontiers and draws the routes straight across Holland and Belgium!

No, the British people and the British cause are not as bad as the British would make out. But some one ought to help them tell the world.

Nofrontier News Service.

The Thin Red Line

All the world is having fun with Communists, who have had to exceed their annual nimbleness and perform extraordinary about-faces in recent weeks. But particular merriment has been caused in London by a writer who, after obvious research, published the following analysis of how the *Daily Worker* of England tried to handle various points of view it found necessary to express after the Red Army marched into Poland.

On page 1 it states that the Soviet government took action only when the Polish defense collapsed.

On page 2 it describes how Warsaw is still fighting, five days after the Red Army advanced. Scattered elsewhere in the paper are statements (a) that the Polish government does not exist; (b) that the British government could still send war planes to help the Polish government (which does not exist); (c) that the liberated population welcomed the Russians without firing a shot; and (d) that Kalinin, President of the Soviet Union, has decorated Red Army officers for courage under fire.

Nofrontier News Service.

Thus Far and No Farther

J. L. GARVIN

Two of the greatest free nations in history, close neighbors to each other, had imperilled the foundations of their greatness and the soul of their freedom by their reluctance to leave peace and the ways of peace. While tyrannous violence trampled lesser peoples with extending impunity, and grew to giant size, the famous western peoples called Powers exposed themselves to charges of cowardice and impotence. While their irresolution and unpreparedness continued they were summoned to eat humiliation and accept jeopardy. The danger of coercion, subjection, and dishonor approached ever nearer to themselves. It came by degrees to a point where the western democracies had to realize and to feel in the core of their hearts the unchanged truth of the scriptural warning that you must give your life to have it—that unless you are resolved to save your soul alive you have no longer a soul and are unworthy of any life.

Britain and France had to say: "Thus far and no farther." They had not only to say it. They had to mean it and attest it. On that in very truth they had to stake all their existence. "Once for every man and nation comes the moment to decide." The western democracies had to choose once and forever. Either they had to make a stand or own their impotence and their ignominy. Either they had to make their stand together at any cost against unbearable menace and encroachment, blighting all the wholesome conditions of free life and perverting the latest phase of civilization into nightmare of mechanized barbarism. Or else confess that their free systems, in fact, are fundamentally unsound; that something has gone out of them; that they no longer represent the spirit and power of two of the greatest free nations in history; that they are degenerate in bone and marrow; and that the day and dream of democracy are over.

Those confessions and submissions were impossible .....

.....

When they [England and France] saw that no alternative was to be allowed to them short of surrender and shame—then, and only then, they recognized the unescapable alternative.

—*London Observer.*